# THE VINDICATION OF A LATE PAMPHLET,

(ENTITULED,

## Obedience and Submiſſion TO THE PRESENT GOVERNMENT,

Demonſtrated from

Bp. *Overal's* Convocation-Book)

From the Falſe Gloſſes, and Illuſive Interpretations of a Pretended Anſwer.

*By the Author of the Firſt Pamphlet.*

*LONDON:*

Printed for **Ric. Baldwin**, near the *Oxford-Arms-Inn* in *Warwick-Lane*. MDCXCI.

THE

# VINDICATION

OF A LATE

# PAMPHLET,

(ENTITLED,

## Obedience and Submission

TO THE

## PRESENT GOVERNMENT,

Demonstrated from

Dp. *Overall's* Convocation-Book)

from the Pale Glosses, and illusive Interpretations of a Pretended Answer.

*By the Author of the First Pamphlet.*

LONDON:

Printed for [illegible], [illegible] the Oxford-Arms-Inn

[illegible] MDCXCI.

# THE PREFACE.

MAlice *and* Ignorance *are very Spiteful and Opprobrious Words, and such as the Author had little Comfort of, since he saw them in the Printed Pamphlet; for he had learnt, That* the Wrath of Man worketh not the Righteousness of God; *And his design was not, to provoke and exasperate; but, if he could, to win, and prevail upon his Non-juring Brethren with Calmness and Composedness; to examine candidly, whether what he had writ, was the Sense of that Learned Convocation, or no? Hoping that if they found it was, they might be brought over to comply with, and increase the Happiness of this Present Government. Far, therefore, was he from reproaching them with* Malice *or* Ignorance; *for he Reverenced the Persons, and Admired the Parts, and lamented the loss of many of them. So that the Truth is, those words never fell from the Pen of the Author; and therefore he desires*

*that the* **Dissembling Stationer**, *who abused him in Printing the Book without his knowledg, may be examined about it; for till those words were Printed, he knew nothing of them. Whoever, therefore would be so abused, may commit his Papers to Mr.* C----, *and from his Confederacy with the Non-Jurors Party, he may expect to be so treated.*

---

THE

# THE VINDICATION OF OBEDIENCE TO THE Present Government, &c.

## CHAP. I.

*Concerning the Imputation caſt on thoſe who took the Oaths before the Publication of the Convocation-Book.*

THE firſt Effort of the Anſwerer, is an Imputation of Guilt upon all the Jurors, and that, *whether the Allegations of the Author from the Convocation* (p. 1.) *be true or falſe.* This is hard on many a good man, that knew nothing, either of the obſcure Convocation, or the obſcurer Author: But ſo it is, *For this can by no means juſtifie them, being at the beſt, but a Pretence taken up after the Fact; and as a ſubſequent Law cannot condemn, ſo neither can it juſtifie a Fact previous to it.* But doth he think the Author produced this for a Reaſon of what he had beforehand done? The Anſwerer is not ſo ſoft, but he knew this to be only an Inducement to ſuch as himſelf, that were more ſcrupulous of the Equity and Legality of it. And the Caſe is this,

The Church of *England* had not by any Publick Act, that we knew of, interpoſed her Judgment on either ſide, but every man was,

was left to the Direction of his own Conſcience, guided by the General Principles of that Church, and the Word of God: And all the Obligation that the Church could lay upon them, was only an acting conſonantly to her declared Principles. Hereupon, ſome took the Oaths, and ſome did not: and yet I dare not think but that both Parties acted on a Principle of Conſcience. Afterwards an old Convocation-Book is produced, and the Jurors peruſing it, diſcover the Doctrine of the Church of *England* to juſtify their Proceedings. Now though the ſubſequent Diſcovery could not be produced, as the Ground and Reaſon of their Previous Act; yet, ſure I am, it doth clear and vindicate them from that *Scandal*, of their deſerting their Old Principles, which ſome men labour to caſt upon them: And that was all that was deſigned from it.

But if in the Innocency of our Souls we had acted beſides the Principles of the Church of *England*, which were not ſufficiently declared to us; could thoſe who kept this Book ſo long private, and afterwards publiſh'd it, as if it had been meant for a Snare to our Conſciences, hold themſelves excuſed? Whatever they can do in this re-

P. 2. ſpect, we are call'd upon to *ſhew any other Publick Act of the Church of* England, *any Opinion of one of the approved Sons thereof, the practice of any one that own'd her Principles, in favour of the Doctrines we now teach, and the Practices we now follow, and then we* ſhall be allow'd to *ſay ſomething*. To obtain his favour, though the Principles whereupon men took the Oaths, were various, yet I will inſtance ſome of them, and oblige my Anſwerer, by confirming them both by the Authority of Principles and Practice; which is all that a Man can require. Now,

1. Some men took the Oaths upon a Suppoſition, That the Violation of the Fundamental Laws of the Land, did releaſe them from the Duty of their Allegiance: and though the Convocation-Book doth no where purpoſely diſcourſe this Caſe, yet the Notion that it gives of

P. 27. Tyranny (of which more preſently) and its vindicating the *Jews* in oppoſing *Antiochus Epiphanes*, a Tyrant, leaves us very doubtful of their ſenſe herein. But tho they be ſilent, ſince the Opinion of one Church-of-*England* man, that is a Man approved, will ſatisfie the Anſwerer, he ſhall have Biſhop *Bilſon*'s Judgment in this Caſe, who diſcourſing purpoſely of Chriſtian Subjecti-

P. 279. on, *Dare not raſhly pronounce all that reſiſt, to be Rebels; be-*
Ed. 1586. *cauſe Caſes may ſo fall out, even in Chriſtian Kingdoms, where the People may plead their Right againſt their Prince, and not be charged with Rebellion.* And being demanded to produce an Example, he adds,

adds, *If a Prince should go about to subject his Kingdom to a Foreign Realm; or Change the Form of the Commonwealth from Empery to Tyranny; or neglect the Laws established by Common Consent of Prince and People, to execute his own pleasure; in these, saith he, and other Cases, which might be named, if the Nobles and Commons joyn together to defend their Ancient and Accustomed Liberty, Regiment and Law, they may not well be counted Rebels.*

This will justifie, I think, all those that deserted his Late Majesty, had they done more than they did. For an Embassy to *Rome*, an Arbitrarines over Laws, and before the Oaths were imposed, (yea, probably before the Desertion) an Open Negotiation with *France*, which means our Slavery; amounts to such a Vindication of us and them, as cannot from this Principle be denied.

And this his Determination is not destitute of all Reason: For if our Allegiance respect primarily the Government, and then the Governour, as the Head of it, as Bishop *Sanderson* seems to intimate; it follows thence, That by vertue of the Duty that we owe unto the Government, Allegiance must (although the Rightful Governour by withdrawing, incapacitate himself to receive it) be paid somewhere or other, or else the Government must be dissolved. And since this Learned Bishop judged thus, I doubt not, but as some others that built on the same Principles, he would have practised so also. *See his Case of the Engagement.*

2. Others supposing that the King's Desertion, or Abdication, (which you will) left them in a State of Liberty, thought their late Oath of Allegiance to him was vacated, and so were free to oblige themselves anew. And my Lord *Clarendon*, observing that the Word *Abdicate* is no *new Word*; nor the Caprice and Humour of Princes *to abdicate their Kingdoms*, a new thing: And representing it as *the hardest Case of Subjects, without their Privity, to be left in an instant, without any Protection, without any Security, as a Prey to all that are too strong for them.* He adds, *That it is no New Transaction for Kings and Princes to resign and* RELINQUISH THEIR CROWN AND SOVEREIGNTY; *nor may it be the better for being old.* Yet besides other Accounts there mentioned; *Some Princes*, saith he, *have been so* HUMOROUS, *as upon the* FROWARDNESS AND REFRACTORINESS OF THEIR SUBJECTS, AND BECAUSE THEY COULD NOT GOVERN IN THAT MANNER THEY HAD A MIND TO DO, TO ABDICATE THE GOVERNMENT, AND WOULD HAVE BEEN GLAD AFTERWARDS TO HAVE RESU- Surv. of Lev. p. 94, 95.

*RESUMED IT.* Now, I imagine, according to the Judgment of that Great Statesman, and true Church-man, that our Allegiance to the Late King is void.

And the Letter (of which I have sufficient Testimony) sent from the Jesuits to King *James*, at *Sailsbury*, advising him to leave the Kingdom, with a promising Assurance, That he should be *Restored, and have his ENDS upon us*; implies something worse than a Caprice or Humour.

3. The most that I have had Converse with, conclude their Present Majesties to have a Right to, as well as Possession of the Crown; and that not only from the Law of the Land, which receives and owns them as Legal King and Queen; but also upon the Appeal which they made to God, for the Injustice done them, on account of the Impostor; which being determined on their sides, fairly gives them a Divine Right. And if so, then the Ground-work of the Gentleman's whole Answer is undermined, and his Building must fall. And this the Author in his Pamphet asserted; but because he knew not what to say to it, he haughtily past it by.

And thus much for the Principles of some Approved Church-of-*England*-men.

Then for their Practice. The Case of the Engagement, represented by the Judicious Bishop *Sanderson*, who plainly intimates some good men to have taken it, and which is left almost in an *Æquilibrio* by that profound Casuist; nay, and which was taken by a Great and Good Man (now with God) a Dying Advocate of the Doctrine of Passive Obedience, shews the Practices of some that have owned her Principles, not to be altogethee repugnant to ours. But this is an unpleasing Subject, because reflexive upon other men. From hence therefore let us proceed to enquire something after the Convocation-Book.

---

## CHAP. II.

### *An Account of the Convocation-Book, and why it wanted the Royal Confirmation.*

THE Sense and meaning of this Convocation being to be enquired after, especially in these two things, 1. Whether Right must of necessity be united to Authority, before our Allegiance can

can be due unto it? And 2. When a Revolution of Government may be supposed to have obtained a thorow Settlement? I thought it not amiss to enquire into the Reasons for the calling of the Convocation; the circumstances of Affairs when the Book was written; and the Causes why it was laid to sleep, not being suffer'd to appear with the Royal Confirmation: For the understanding of these, will mightily assist us to comprehend their meaning. And what I have received is thus:

The *Spaniards* growing weary of their wars with the *United-Provinces*, seeing Queen *Elizabeth*, the great supporter of the *Dutch* against the House of *Austria*, to grow old, and knowing that *James*, then King of the *Scots*, was, after her decease, to succeed her in the Throne of *England*, a Prince of a Peaceable Disposition; they made previous Applications to him, to pre-engage him, when he came to the Crown of *England*, to mediate a Truce, or Peace, between them and *Holland*. The good Queen, according to the course of Nature, in some time after dies; whereupon the *Spaniards*, by their Ambassador, as soon almost as King *James* was seated on the *English* Throne, renew their Negotiation with him, to mediate the foresaid Truce; supposing the *United-Provinces* would scarce refuse his Interposition, because at that time he held in his hands some Cautionary Towns of theirs, which had been delivered to the late Queen. The King being of himself inclinable to Peace, and to oblige the *Spaniards* (who had a Pontifical claim to the Crown of *England*) to own and acknowledg his Right and Title to that Crown, that so he might secure to himself the certainty of enjoying ease and safety, undertakes the Mediation: But difficulties arising from the *Dutch* Pretentions, who demanded to be acknowledged a Free and Independent State, tho' they had but lately withdrawn themselves from the Crown of *Spain*; His Majesty of *Great Britain* taking this to be a tender Point, and of great consequence to all Crowned Heads, if a Province or Principality having shaken off their Ancient Lord, might set up for a Free and Independent State; desirous also to over-rule the *Dutch* in their Allegations to this Claim, on the apprehension of a Fear that it would void the overtures of the designed Truce: That he might do it with the greater appearance of Authority and Judgment, he resolves to consult his Convocation about the Origine of Government, its various Forms, Alterations, and Modifications, intending them especially to exalt the Sacredness and Grandeur of Monarchy.

Accordingly the Convocation go to work, and deduce the Power of Government from its natural and prime Original; taking notice what it was in it self; whence Tyranny and Arbitrary Power uſurped upon the Patriarchal: How that again was retrenched, and the True Fatherly Government ſetled amongſt his own People the *Jews*, till the Captivity of *Babylon*; giving alſo an Account what became of them afterwards, what Revolutions they underwent, till they, and all the Weſtern World were made ſubject to the *Roman* Eagle.

This led them to treat of the Variation of Government by the Providence of God, who caſts down Kings, and ſets up Kings; who alters Kingdoms, and turns them into Ariſtocratical, or Democratical States; and on the contrary, States into Dukedoms, Elective Monarchies, and the like. As alſo what Obedience ought to be paid to the ſaid Governments, when they are once throughly ſetled upon ſuch Revolutions; laying down a Rule, when People with a ſafe Conſcience may, nay ought to pay Obedience to their Authority. But their Determination herein touching too hard upon the Claims of Sovereigns, and the Royalties of Monarchies (of which ſcarce ever Prince had more tender feeling, than that his Majeſty of *Britain*) King *James* is diſpleaſed with it, and them; charging them, that they had dipped too deep into what all Princes did reſerve amongſt the *Arcana Imperii*, as from his Letter at the end may be ſeen: and by Orders ſent by Mr. Sollicitor, reſtrains them from medling any farther in it. And this, I believe, might be a Reaſon, why the Convocation, which had promiſed to treat of the Government of the whole World, did not handle more particularly the Caſe of Free and Independent States, which are, and were, one ſort of Government in the World, and comprized by them (as I before hinted) in the word Kingdoms; and which the clew of their diſcourſe would have led them to; and they plainly ſeem to aim at, *Ch. & Ca.* 23. had they not by a Prohibition from the King been reſtrained.

However, they ſaid enough to maintain the *Dutch* Pretences, who inſiſted immovably on the Claim of being acknowledged a Free, and Independent State; or elſe no Accommodation would be hearkened to, no Truce concluded. And the *Spaniſh* Affairs being ſuch, at that time, as would not ſuffer them to conteſt the matter any longer, they thought it convenient to yield to their Claim (or if you would have it in the Anſwerer's Language, to transfer their Right over to the States) whereupon a Truce betwixt them was concluded, whereof King *James* was made the Chief Guarantee. And theſe

these were the Circumstances when the Convocation sat, as from the History of those Times, the Date of the Convocation, which was called *Anno* 1603, and continued by Adjournments and Prorogations, to 1610. that is, a year after the aforesaid Truce was concluded, which commenced in *April*, *Anno* 1609. and ended after the Term of Twelve years; and above all, by King *James* his Commission to this Convocation, if we could be so happy as to get a sight of it.

Thus the Affairs of *Spain* and *Holland* were Accommodated; but it netled King *James*, to have the Convocation determine so positively of Obedience to be due to Governments established upon such Revolutions as are there mentioned. Hereupon it is supposed that he refused the Canons his Royal Assent, and left them to be devoured *Blattis & Tineis*, or at least by Old Time, if by nothing else.

But for the Honour of the Convocation, something was to appear, lest that Venerable Assembly should seem to meet only as the Emperor with his Army, to gather Cockle-shels; And therefore, as I guess (for it is no more) the Book, call'd *God and the King*, (which whoever compares with this, will find in many things of its last Part, to be an Abstract of some of these Chapters) was collected hence, and sent abroad into the World to atone his displeased Majesty. And so much for the Convocation, and the Occasion of their being summoned, and Commissionated.

## CHAP. III.

### *Concerning the Four Propositions of Government; Extracted out of the Convocation-Book.*

A Grievous Charge is now laid against me, That though I pretended to demonstrate, yet I have *omitted many things at are material, and pertinent to the present Controversie about* P. 2. *vernment and Allegiance. That what I have drawn up into Pro-itions, I have in some of them (if not in all) curtail'd and diminished the l sense of the Convocation. That, above all, by adding words and Limi-ions, and Glosses, and Explications, I have destroyed the Text, and per-ly corrupted, and perverted their sense.* Well! I will not take any ceptions at his words, else how I could argue on a Subject, with-

out adding Glosses and Explications, *&c.* I know not; but how far I am guilty, I leave the Reader to judge, and so hasten to the Propositions. The First of which was,

## PROP. I.

*That the Power of Kings was originally Patriarchal, Derived from God, and not from the People*, Ca. 2, 6, 13.

On which the Complaint is, That *I have expounded*
P. 12. *away, as I always do, the sense of the Convocation*; for, it seems, I say, that Kings are, and ought to be bound up
P. 13. by Laws; and *he prays to know by what Laws?* The very next words tell him: but because nothing will digest with him but the express words of the Convocation-Book, from them he might have understood, that they were the
P. 9, & 11. Laws of God and Nature, as they did concern Civil Societies and Governments, which surely ought to bind; But why did not I express it in the words of the Convocation-Book, to which I refer? A man hath need of patience that hath to deal with such a Questionarist. But to give him satisfaction. It was because I had a mind to deliver in general what the Convocation had said but in Particular. For that very same Reason that obliged the Kings of *Judah*, to the Observation of the Civil-Laws of their Particular Government, obliged all other Kings to the observation of the Fundamental Establish'd Laws of their Respective Kingdoms. And since it is the King's being bound up by Laws that stomachs the Answerer, I desire he would take notice from the Convocation, what those Princes are that will not be bound up by Law; *For Nimrod*, say they, (and by a Parity of Reason we may add all such like Princes) *not contenting himself with the Patriarchal or Mild Government, ordained of God by the Laws of Reason and Nature, became a Tyrant, and Lord of Confusion* Should I have delivered this Notion of Tyranny, to be sure we had had it in his Scheme of New Notions; and therefore I recommend it to the Answerers consideration: Only I observe from them, That a Patriarchal Power, and the being limited in the Exercise of Power by Law are not inconsistent.

PRO

## PROP. II.

*That Descent in Hereditary Kingdoms, is the Ordinary way whereby a Right and Title to the Crown is claimable.*

His Quarrel here is, that these Words, *The Ordinary Way*, are Words of mine own; for he observes that I add, *I say, the ordinary Way*: And since these were Words of mine own, how could I let him know it otherwise, than by telling him, and all men, that they were *my Saying*. Surely the Cause is sinking, when men catch thus at Reeds and Rushes. But since I must not *say*, pray do you say: Is the Proposition true or false? If true, why so captious at it? and if false, why do you not reject it? No matter for that, for *tho' there be some extraordinary ways in Hereditary Kingdoms, that may give a Right and Title to the Crown besides Descent; yet the Author's extraordinary way is none of them.* P. 2. P. 2, 3. For this I shall appeal to the Reader to judge; as also for his ingenuity in interpreting the Author's Meaning from the Convocation-Book, which asserts, *That the Lord both may, and is able to overthrow Kings or Emperors, notwithstanding any Claim, Right, Title or Interest, which they can challenge to their Countries, Kingdoms, or Empires*, to be only God's *Permissive Providence*, which, I think, the Author scarce mentions above once, and that far from the Sense that the Answerer would insinuate. But my Citation and his must be adjusted anon, and therefore here I will speak no more of this matter.

## PROP. III.

*That no Violence is to be used to Kings from their own Subjects, for any Irregularities that they commit.*

*This*, he saith, *doth not fully express the sense of the Convocation*; yet he intimates not wherein it is defective; *but the Author's Comment destroys it.* How does this appear? Why, Because the Doctrines of Passive Obedience to a Government established by Law, whether the Prince be Limited or Absolute, is of absolute Necessity to the support of the Government. And is it not so? *But this is Mr.* Johnson's *Passive Obedience, that is limited to the Laws, and not to the Prince.* P. 3. The Author troubles not himself in thinking what it is, but shrewdly suspects

ſpects that the Anſwerer was conſcious to himſelf that he abuſed him, when in the very next Words he confeſſes, that *if ſo, this is not only a plain Contradiction to the Convocations, but to his own extracted Propoſition.* Whence the Author ſuppoſes, that his Suppoſitive *If*, argues too manifeſtly a conſcientiouſneſs of Guilt.

Before I paſs hence, I muſt take notice of a fine Word that the Anſwerer hath met with, *Yclepd Irregularity*, which again he ſuppoſes the Author can mean *nothing leſs by, than a Prince's acting and governing againſt Law*: by his favour, *beſides Law*, will amount to an irregularity; and for his new-found Univerſal *Any*, when the Logicians ſhall ſo eſteem it, I will retrench my Indefinites.

P. 3.

## PROP. IV.

*That having ſworn Allegiance to a Prince, we cannot without the dreadful guilt of Perjury, transfer our Allegiance, whilſt he continues to have an Authoritative Right and Title to the Crown.*

Kindly here he corrects the falſe Impreſſion, C. 36. which ſhould have been the 30.

But what moſt grieves him here are, the Cramp-words of *an Authoritative Right and Title*, and not finding them in the Convocation-Book, he diſcovers again, that I confeſs them my own, in that *I ſay, an Authoritative Right and Title*; but *he deſires the favour once more to know where I had them.* I am loth to diſoblige him, and therefore may he know, that I had them from the Words of *Can.* 31. where the Authority of *Alexander* is acknowledged to be ſetled amongſt the *Jews*; which, if the Story be true (and the Convocation-Book, not I, am to anſwer for that) of neceſſity muſt be in the Life-time of *Darius*, as the Book plainly intimates, *Ca.* & *Can.* 30 & 31. taking notice, that he had preſerved his Life by flight; and if ſo, there was an Expiration, though not of *Darius*'s Life, yet of his Authoritative Right and Title.

And this the Anſwerer fairly confeſſeth in theſe Words. *The Convocation ſuppoſes that* Darius *had not at that time that Authoritative Title the Author mentions; for they tell us expreſly, that this was when* Darius *was eſcaped by flight, after his Army was diſcomfited.* And ſo both he and they confeſs him at this time to be *Alive.*

P. 27.

But

But ſaith he, *The Author goes on* (and on he may go, for any ſtop that he hath given him) *aſſerting, that the* Claim of Right *without the Authority, cannot Challenge our Allegiance.* Which, whether the Senſe of the Convocation, or no, is now to be examin'd.

## CHAP. IV.

### Right *and* Authority, *Whether in the Senſe of the Convocation, to be always joyn'd as the Foundation of our Allegiance.*

ONE of the greateſt Points in Controverſy, between the Author and the Anſwerer, is conconcering Right and Authority; and whether they muſt of neceſſity be united, before a Foundation, whereon to build our Allegiance, can be laid; and therefore to place this in the cleareſt Light, I will

I. Conſider what is meant by Right and Authority.
II. Lay down the Grounds on which each Party builds their Confidence of the Convocation favouring them.
III. Impartially, and in their own words, ſtate the matter in debate betwixt them. And.
IV. Fairly adjuſt the Authority that each Party brings from the Convocation, that the unbiaſt Reader may ſee where the Truth lies. Now.

1. For the word *Right*, when it is ſeparated from, and oppoſed to *Authority*, the Author always underſtands a Right or Title founded upon Proximity of Blood, which the Anſwerer calls a Legal Title: I ſuppoſe he means it of the Law of Nature, which indeed doth reſpect the aforeſaid Right of Proximity of Blood. Otherwiſe, if he means it of the Laws of the Land, it is very plain, whatever Nature may, our Conſtitution is not ſuch, as of neceſſity annexeth the Crown to the next Heir of the Blood; for to ſay, that the King and Parliament cannot diſpoſe of it otherwiſe, is a *Præmunire*. And it was actually diſpoſed of otherwiſe in its deſcent, either upon Queen *Mary*, or Queen *Elizabeth*, one of them being what I will not Name. A King *de facto* too, is a Legal King, according

cording to the Laws of the Realm. Yet, our Anſwerer, I believe in his Senſe will not own him ſuch; ſo that by Right, he means the Right of Nature, or Proximity of Blood, which is what the Author underſtood by it, when he oppoſed it to Authority, nor could he indeed underſtand by it any thing elſe; for *Authority* in this Caſe is nothing elſe, but that Divine Power, which God, who is Superior to all Laws, intruſts a Perſon with from above, to act and execute with Equity and Mercy, the Adminiſtration of a Government committed to his Hands. So that the Oppoſition betwixt *Right and Authority*, in the Author's Senſe, and he thinks in the Convocation too, (of which anon) is not as the Anſwerer ſuppoſeth betwixt *Right*, *i. e.* a Legal Title and *Poſſeſſion*; (which he pretends is all that the Author means by *Authority*; but the Author, if he will give him Liberty to explain himſelf, means ſomething more by it, as is above expreſſed); But plainly the Oppoſition is betwixt *Right*, as that implies a Civil Title amongſt Men, which excludes the Pretences of all other Humane *Rights* and *Authority*, as that includes in it a Claim from God. Theſe two generally are united; but God for Cauſes beſt known to himſelf, may, and ſometimes doth ſeparate them; and when they are thus ſeparated, ſince it is by him that Kings Reign, the Author ſuppoſeth his Allegiance to be due to God's Authority, and not to the Civil Right: And he thought he had proved this from the Inſtance of the Kings of *Iſrael* and *Judah*, who being led Captive into *Babylon*, though they ſurvived there, could lay no claim to the Allegiance of their Subjects. And this it is, or nothing, that the Anſwerer muſt oppoſe. But he Equivocates in his Notion of *Right*, and ſometimes underſtands by it *Civil Right*, ſometimes *Divine*; and on this Homonimy the whole Stream of his Anſwer runs.

He muſt underſtand by it *Civil Right*, when he puts
Page 4. the Query, *Whether Allegiance may be ſeparated from Right, and transferred to Authority without Right?* So, when he affirms, that according to the Convocation,
Ibid. *Right without Authority may, and ought to challenge Allegiance; and that Authority without Right cannot challenge it.*
Where, if he do not mean a *Civil Right*, he fights without an Adverſary. But then, in the very next Page, by *Right*, he muſt underſtand *Divine Right*; where in the caſe of *Jehu* and *Ahud*, he
Page 5. ſaith, *It is plain from the Convocation-Book, that they had a Right before Allegiance became due.* Where by *Right* he

he must understand *Divine Right*, for they had no *Civil Right*, or Legal Claim to the Crown; for *Joram* being in Possession and the other out, his Title was far better by all Humane Laws: And as for *Ahud*, his being acknowledged a Subject, he could pretend no Legal Title to the Crown. Nor can he evade this, by saying, that they had both Gods expres Nomination, for that cannot alter the nature of things, and create them a Civil Legal Title, altho it gives them a Divine Authority, which is far Superior unto it. 'Tis true, he affirms that the *Convocation expresly asserts* Jehu *to be a Lawful King*; but I expect he should recall his words, unless he can make a Note of Similitude, *As*, of necessity to be a Character of Identity, and prove things that may be construed only to be alike or equal, to be the very same; for the words are, *That* Jehu, *upon the knowledge of Gods will, and the Submission of the Princes, and Captains of* Israel *unto him*, As to their Lawful King, *did put in execution the said Message by killing* Joram. Where the words only expres the fullness of the Submission of the Captains to him; who submitted as intirely *As to their Lawful King*, but need not at all to respect a Legal Title for he had none. Thus the Author hath declared what he means by *Right and Authority*, and doubts not but to manifest it in its due place, to be the meaning of the Convocation too. For, *page* 5. *page* 46.

Secondly, The account that he hath given of the calling of this Convocation, and the Circumstances of Affairs that during its continuance occur'd; (which was to consider of the Claim of the United Provinces, as to their being a Free and Independent State,) doth very plainly Evidence it. For since their Authority could have no Legal Foundation, it must wholly be derived from a Divine Interposition; and it was not Civil Right, but Gods Providence and Pleasure that possessed them of the Powers of Government. I know the Answerer pretends, *the Doctrines of Passive Obedience and Non-resistance to be the whole Design of the Book.* Now all that I shall say to this at present is, that neither of these is so much as once expresly named in all the Book, and that this is the *whole design of it*, will be found difficult for him to prove. But upon the apprehension of these different Ends and Intention of the Convocation, the different Construction of the words of the Book, are in some measure grounded, therefore as I promised, *page* 21.

Thirdly, I muſt impartially, and in their own words ſtate the Matter in Debate betwixt them. And the Author plainly affirms, that *Right and Authority may be ſeparated, and*
page 5. *that when they are ſo ſeparated, the Claim of Right*, i. e. *Civil Right, without the Authority*, i. e. *the Divine Power of Government, cannot challenge our Allegiance.* On the other ſide the Anſwerer aſſerts, *that Right without Authority*
page 4. *may, and ought to challenge our Allegiance; and that Authority without Right cannot challenge it.* Now if Reaſon might decide it, ſince the Authority even in Civil Right comes from God, *and the Powers that be are ordained of God*, it ſeems ſtrange, that the Ordinance of God cannot command our Allegiance, becauſe it doth not quadrate with the Conſtitution of Man: or that God who is acknowledged by the Anſwerer to be above all Laws, cannot by his Providence diſpoſe of his own Power, but according to Law. But I muſt remember, that our Appeal was to be to the Convocation-book, and to it therefore let us go; which is the laſt thing.

Fourthly, To adjuſt the Authority that each Party brings from the Convocation-book, that the Unprejudiced Reader may ſee on which ſide the plain Truth doth lye, I will begin with the Author, whoſe Aſſertion is, *That the Claim of Right without Authority, is not ſufficient to challenge our Allegiance*; the terms of which being before explained. he produceth theſe Authorities from the Convocation-book to confirm it; which if a Man will but open his Eyes, are poſitive and determinative: The Ground on which the Convocation builds, the Juſtification of *Jehu*, and *Ahad*, in laying violent hands on their lawful Sovereigns clearly prove it, for that is this, that God *may, and is able to*
page 53. *overthrow any Kings or Emperors, notwithſtanding any Claim, Right, Title or Intereſt, which they can challenge to their Countries, Kingdoms or Empires.* So that here is an Authority to which the Captains did pay Allegiance, as to their *Lawful King* acknowledged without Right, and executed without Guilt. To put this paſt all doubt, the Convocation-book having told us, that *it was not lawful for any Perſon what-*
ibid. *ſoever, upon pretence of any Revelation, Inſpiration or Commandment from the Divine Majeſty, either to touch the Perſon of his Sovereign, or to bear Arms againſt him*; makes this Exception, *Except God ſhould firſt advance the ſaid Perſon from his private Eſtate, and make him a King or an Abſolute Prince, to ſucceed his*

*his late Maſter in his Kingdom or Principality.* Which words if they were not intended to expreſs a Separation of *Authority from Right*, and when they are ſo ſeparated, to vindicate our Allegiance to the Perſon, whom God from a private Eſtate advanceth to be King, have no deſign or meaning at All. It is to no purpoſe for the Anſwerer to pretend here Gods expreſs Nomination; for that is only to ſay that God may do by Revelation, what he cannot by Providence; and the one ought to be obeyed, and not the other, whereas if it be Gods doing in either way, it requires our Submiſſion.

Again, the Convocation-book expreſly teacheth, *That Authority, tho unjuſtly gotten, and wrung by force from the True and Lawful Poſſeſſor (who ſurely had, and is here ſuppoſed to have the Legal Right) being always Gods Authority, is ever when any ſuch Alterations are throughly ſettled, to be Reverenced and Obeyed by all ſorts of People, and that for Conſcience ſake.* Where if they do not diſtinguiſh *Authority from Right*, and require our Obedience to Authority againſt Right, no words can declare it. *page* 57.

Again, ſpeaking of ſuch Governments as are founded on (being *begun*) *by Rebellion* (and I hope the Anſwerer will not ſay that Rebellion hath Right on its ſide) the Convocation owns *them, when throughly ſettled, to have Gods Authority, and that the People who live within the Territories of ſuch new Governments, are bound to be ſubject to Gods Authority.* If this be not Demonſtration, I will pretend no more to it; for it is hence plain enough, that the Claim of Right without Authority, cannot challenge our Allegiance, ὅτι θέσει οὐδὲν. *page* 59.

The Caſe of the *Moabites* and *Ammonites* who had thus Authority over the *Jews*, the Hiſtory of the *Kings* and *Chronicles*, and the very frame of the Governments in being throughout all the World, are ſo many Inſtances of this Truth.

What the Anſwerer affirms to be the meaning of the Convocation-book, is this, that *Right without Authority, may and ought to challenge our Allegiance, and that Authority without Right cannot challenge it.* Now all that he brings for proof of this, are theſe words, *If any Man ſhall affirm that the Kingdom of* Judah, *by Gods Ordinance going by Succeſſion, when one King was Dead, his Heir was not in Right their King, (howbeit by ſome* Athaliah *he might be hindered from enjoying it) or that the People were not bound without any farther Circumſtance, upon ſufficient notice of their former Kings death, to have obeyed his* *page* 4. *Can.* 17.

*Heir apparent, as their lawful King, he doth greatly err.* Add the Instance of *Joash* and *Athaliah, Where notwithstanding* Joash *had none of our Authors Authoritative Right and Title,* (as the Answerer saith, but if you believe it, you believe a notorious Untruth, as will shortly appear) *and had only the Claim of Right, without the Authority, yet when* Jehojada *called the People together, and acquainted them with the Preservation of the Prince, they altogether by a Covenant acknowledged their Allegiance to him, as to their Lawful King, and in consequence of that slew* Athaliah *the Usurper.* This is the whole of his Pretences, and all that he can make of it is, That God having declared that he would not give his Authority to any Person to Sway the Scepter of *Judah,* but only such as were of the Line of *David*; whoever did ascend the Throne, not being of that Stock and Lineage, did Usurp upon Gods Authority. And when he can produce such a Declaration of Gods Pleasure concerning all other Kingdoms, the Kingdoms of the whole World, (of which in General the Convocation treats) then, and not till then, we shall allow his Plea; for surely a particular and exempt priviledged Case of the Kingdom of *Judah,* will not be a standing Rule for the Kingdoms of the whole World.

*Ch. & Can.* 23. *page* 4.

## *The Case of* Athaliah.

But because this is all that he can build on, it shall have a particular Disquisition. The Case of *Athaliah* is the Burden of the Song, let us therefore examine the Convocation-book about it, which represents it thus.

*Can.* 14. David *was called and advanced to the Kingdom of* Judah *by God himself, as truly as* Aaron *was to the Priesthood*; *and* Davids *Posterity had by Gods Ordinance, as rightful an Interest to succeed him in his said Kingdom, as either* Aaron's *Sons had to succeed him in the Priesthood, or* Moses *and* Joshua, *and the rest of the Judges, (notwithstanding that God himself did chuse and named them particularly) had in their Governments: Nor had the People then, any more Authority to withstand* David, *or any of his Posterity from being their King, than they had to have expelled either* Moses *or* Joshua, *or any of the rest of the Judges whom God by name did appoint to govern them*

*See Can.* 17.

But

But *Athaliah*, after the Death of her Son *Ahaziah*, killed all his Children save one, who was secretly conveyed away, and usurped the Throne, which she held Six years. After which space of time, *Jehojada* acquainting the Fathers of *Judah* and *Benjamin*, that *Joash* of the Seed of *David*, to whose Posterity God had expressly given the Crown; nay, and what was more, *that it was the Lords Will that he should reign over them*, was alive; they in Obedience to Gods express command, acknowledge their Allegiance to him, and advance him to the Throne. *In all which process* (saith the Convocation) *nothing was done either by* Jehojada *the High Priest, or by the rest of the Princes and People of* Judah *and* Benjamin, *which God himself did not require at their hands.* And let the Answerer produce such an Entail of the Crown upon a Family as this is; let him add to that, Gods express command to Dethrone the Possessor, as the Convocation here saith *Jehojada* and the Princes had to depose *Athaliah*; and then he produceth something to the purpose. Otherwise since they attempted not to Dethrone *Athaliah*, (tho another had as Divine a Right to the Crown, as *Moses* who was named by God) till they were anew acquainted, *that it was the Lords Will, that* Joash *should reign over them*; it would almost move a forward Man to infer the necessity of Circumspection and Caution in the Deposing even of Usurpers. However from the Divine Entailment of the Crown of *Judah* on the Posterity of *David*, it is manifest that Authority could not in them be separated from Right; and therefore the Answerer unjustly affirms, *That* Joash *had not that Authoritative Right and Title which the Author speaks of; but only a Claim of Right without Authority*, the contrary to which from what I have said is very evident.

*Chap.* 23.

*page* 31.

*ibid.*

*page* 4.

What I would observe from the case of *Joash* and *Athaliah* is thus. God by express Revelation had given to *David* and his Posterity the Throne of *Judah* and *Israel*, and no one of those Kingdoms, without opposing the Express Nomination of God, could deny Allegiance to *David* or his Posterity; till he had a Command as expressive to withdraw it, as at first he had to yield it, *i. e.* a plain Revelation to the contrary. For since it was Gods express word to settle those Crowns on *David* and his Posterity, nothing but the same word as Expressive, could revoke the Donation. It was therefore this express word

by

by his Prophet, revoking (for the Sins of his Posterity) that grant to *David*, that excused the Ten Tribes, in refusing their Allegiance to *Rehoboam*, and transferring it to his Competitor: And I believe it was the Admonition of the Prophet *Jeremiah* from God, requiring the Jews to pay Obedience to *Nebuchadnezzar*, that did discharge them of their Obedience to the Posterity of *David*. For the Answerer may please himself with his Conceit of a Transferring Right: But sure I am, that God having once by Prophecy declared his Entailing the Crown on *David* and his Posterity; nothing but a Prophecy to the contrary, as express as that, could ever revoke it, or vindicate them in paying it elsewhere.

What I have discoursed of Gods express Nomination of the Posterity of *David* to rule the House of *Judah*, that it required a Revelation as express to revoke that Authority and Donation; may I think be happily applied unto all other cases, where instead of Personal Designation by Prophecy, the special Indication of Providence exalts Persons and Families unto Thrones, and accordingly Dethrones them. For what Prophecy was to them, both to advance and remove; that Providence must be to us. There is now no Person, or Family, raised to a Crown, but by the Providence of God, and since it is Providence alone that doth inaugurate them, when the same Providence doth Depose them; who are we that we should Fight against God? We have, when once the Prevailing Power doth come unto a Settlement, the same Providence that acted in their Exaltation and Depression, to direct us in our Duty of Allegiance; even as the Jews of old, had the same Spirit of Prophecy to direct them. And since it is Providence alone, that by exalting a Person or Family to a Crown, gives them a Right unto their Subjects Allegiance: I do not understand, but when the same Providence Remands the Power out of their Hands, and transfers it to some other Person, or Family, our Allegiance is transferred also: for the Power being transplanted, our Homage must remove with it, or else we must deny Obedience to that Divine Power which makes Kings, and coming from God is to be reverenced, honored, and obeyed, where ever it pleaseth him to place it. This I take to be a better account of the Reasons of our Allegiance being transferrable from one Person to another, then his new vamped Notion of transferring a Right, which next comes to be examined.

CHAP.

## CHAP. V.

### *Concerning a Prince his transferring a Right.*

THe Anſwerer ſaw, and had not the hardineſs to deny that *there were ſome Inſtances of transferring Allegiance mentioned and juſtified in the Convocation-Book*; and ſince he could not deny them, his Buſineſs is to palliate them. P. 4, 5. Hereupon he ſtarts a new, but no ſound Notion of transferring a Right, and diſhoneſtly Fathers it on the Convocation, for he ſaith in theſe Caſes *i. e.* of Revolutions, *the Convocation never requires nor juſtifies the transferring Allegiance, but only where the Right is transferred likewiſe:* To P. 5. prove which he unluckily Inſtances in the Caſes of *Jehu* and *Ahud.* But good Mr. *Anſwerer* ſpeak out; did *Joram* transfer a Right to *Jehu*, to kill his Perſon and wear his Crown? Did *Eglon* transfer a Right to *Ahud* to ſheath his Dagger in his Belly? Yet *the ſame*, ſaith he, *may be ſaid of the* Jews *Submiſſion and Obedience to the* Babylonians *&c. all mentioned in the Convocation-Book.* If ſo, I am ſure it is ſuch a transfer- P. 5. ring Right, as Mortals were never in the leaſt acquainted with, till the Anſwerer from Mr. *Hobs* was pleaſed to reveal it. And let him here take notice once more, that, *I ſay*, from Mr. *Hobs*, for he was the firſt that ever I heard of that ſtarted the Notion of a transferring of Sovereignty. So that what the Anſwerer would fix upon the Convocation, is indeed downright *Hobbiſm*, and borrowed from the *Leviathan*, where a Power is given to his Sovereign, to renounce P. 114. and transfer the Sovereignty to another.

However on *Jehu* like he drives, and will *have the reſpective Government of the* Babylonians, Perſians, &c. *to have a right of Government over the* Jews, *though not in the ſame manner with the former by God's expreſs Nomination, yet a Right they acquired by the Submiſſion and Acknowledgment of thoſe in whom the Right was.* This he ſaith and requires you to believe it, for he never offers to prove it, but from the Author, who expreſly tells you, *That the Kings of* Iſrael *and* Judah *became not only Tributary, but Subjects to the King of* Babylon. What! by transferring their Right? Not a word of that; yet that was the thing to be proved. But is not this Gentleman happy in his Proof, and full of them too, that

that is forced to borrow from his Adversary Testimonies to his own ruin. But they *submitted* he saith, how I pray? Why! they were conquered, and is not this a pretty way of transferring Right.

I expected he would have produced some Instrument of a Voluntary transferring their Right, but it all dwindles into Force and Power, and they are constrained to part with it, because they cannot keep it. If this be what he means by transferring Right, King *James* his Desertion transferred it as much as their Submission. Nay, and since Cession is one way that he mentions of thus transferring a Right, sure I am, that the Cession of King *James* which had something of Choice and Voluntariness in it being a mixt Action, implies more of his own Will and Freedom in that Transferance, than any instance he hath yet produced. In short, did ever a Conqueror derive the Validity of his Title to his Conquests from the conquered Princes transferring his Right? I am sure of the contrary; and therefore may conclude there was never such a thing as transferring a Right, but only in the Metaphysical Head of Mr. *Hobs* and the Answerer.

P. 19.

## CHAP. VI.

### *A Reply to some Captious Exceptions of the Answerers.*

WE are now come to what the Answerer calls the last of the Authors first Propositions, and he may call it an Apple, or an Oyster, if he please, (for both are now in Season, and) 'tis all one to the Author, who for any thing the Quibbling Answerer hath said (after he had given us a cast of his Wit) meets with him acknowledging it, to lie in this Form.

That *Government derives its Power from God, and not from the People.* Now though this was not so very unlike the first Proposition which was, that, *The Power of Kings was originally Patriarchal, derived from God, and not from the People*, the Predicate being in both the same, he might have seen the Necessity of the Author's enlarging the Subject; which

P. 13.

hope by being only more comprehensive, is not quite another thing. The Convocation undertakes to discourse concerning *the Government of the Kingdoms of the whole World*, by which word Kingdoms, I suppose they do not strictly mean that one Form of Government, but Synecdochically all other Forms of Government to be understood in that, as the chief; hence they treat of *Aristocracy*, &c. so that I was obliged to enlarge the Terms of my Proposition to the Proportion of my design, it being to be the Ground-work of what was to follow: And tho this perhaps will not content the Captious Answerer (who hereupon tells us, *That Government in General is not Patriarchal; neither are other Forms, besides Monarchy, Patriarchal*; and more such-like Stuff) yet he hopes it may satisfie the Candid Reader. But I must observe his Motions, and I cannot tell *what is meant by Gods being the Author of Nature, and consequently of Humane Societies, but he suspects* ('tis a Jealous Man) some bad meaning in it. And if it be as he thinks it is, that Mankind being of a Sociable Nature, by that were directed to Society, and from that, *i. e.* Society, to Government, it contradicts the Authors own Proposition. Now this is only a Spiteful Innuendo, and what a fair Answerer would scorn to be Guilty of, for he very well knows, that in Nature there is a Priority of Order, when there is none of Time, and the Consequences of things there, respect the manner of our Conceptions, not their Existence; as Light is conceived to be Posterior to the Sun, whence it comes, tho they both be at one and the same Instant; even so may Society and Government be Co-existent, yet one Consequent to the other in the order of Nature. But the bad meaning is all his own, for the Expression is so plain, that none, but who had the design of a Scandal, could misinterpret it; for what is more Intelligible than this, that Government in General, deriving its Authority from God the Author of Nature, and consequently, of Humane Societies, must signifie, that the same God who was the Author of our Nature, being Sociable, was consequently the Author of Humane Societies, which must of necessity follow a Sociable Nature. What more strained, forced and disturbed, than his Explication of it is, which first would make me suppose Humane Societies, and then Government, for *they were directed*, saith he, *to Society, and from that to Government*; as if there could be Society without Government, when Government is only an

P. 56.

P. 13.

Administration of Societies. Such another disingenious Practice doth he fly to, wherein he pretends that *quoting a Passage*
P. 25. *out of the Convocation book, I changed Benedictions into Pre-*
P. 47. *dictions, as if they were all one.* Whereas the words were not quoted out of the Convocation-book, but were my own words, put into an Observation that I thence had made; so that he might have understood the word *Benedictions* to have been falsly Printed for *Predictions*; but then he had wanted an Exception against the Author; and by such means as these must a Tottering Cause be supported.

The next thing that he is displeased at, is the Gloss I give upon these words, *That Government is not derived from the People,*
P. 13. *tho their Consent be ordinarily necessary to the Constitution, both of the Form of Government, and the Persons Governing.* And
Ibid. is it not so? he is silent upon it; *But it is plain the Convocation never thought so, but the contrary.* But whence proves he this? not a word of the Pudding; for if you will not believe him, he cannot afford to prove it. But sure I am, *the*
Ch. 17. *Peoples having notice of God, even his appointing Princes, Judges and Kings, that they might conform themselves to Obedience, and their chearfully and with great Thankfulness submitting themselves to be ruled by them, their willingly protesting their Obedience, their following them, their shouting when they saw them, and saying God Save the King, and other such Expressions of their Joy and Gladness, are no Intimations that their Consent was not had in all that was done.* Indeed the Canon saith, *That the King*
Can. 17. *did not receive any such virtue or strength from the People, their said Notice, Presence and Applause, as that without the same the said Callings of God, either by Name or by Succession had been insufficient.* And elsewhere, *That when God raised up*
Can. 23. *Judges to Rule and Govern them, the Peoples consent was not necessary thereunto.* But whoever pretended it was when God immediately did Interpose; or could so much as imagine it? unless we should conceive a People so Fooliſh as not to Acquiesce in the manifest Choice and Determination of an All-wise and an All-good God: or so Besotted, as to think they might insist upon their Right against his Declaration, which was the Case of *Judah*. And for other the best constituted Governments, when the Solemnity of the Coronation is altered, He may then, but not till then, Dispute the Insignificancy of their Consent.

Will

*Well at last however through all the Authors*, and the Answerers, *Shufflings and Intermixings, we are got to this Point*, P. 13. *That Government derives its Power from God, and not from the People*: And because I thought that herein we should agree, I made it the Ground-work of the following as well as it is of the antecedent Discourse; and confirmed it (and who would think the Answerer should be displeased, by having such a pleasing Truth confirmed) by three Observations; all which are so many Arguments, that Government derives its Authority from God. For if all Kingdoms now be in some sort Theocracies; if the Tenure of Sovereigns be such, that God may divest them of that Power, and transfer both it, and the Duty that is owing to it, unto some other Person; it undeniably follows, that Government derives its Power from God. And tho he disproves not one of these, nay fairly acknowledgeth the Truth of the two last, yet his Captious Humour will not suffer him to pass over the first, because there is something that misrepresented, he may find occasion to talk of. Nothing could be fairer, than having observed from the Convocation, that all Kingdoms are now in some sort Theocracies; I should express it in what sort they were so; and this I did, by shewing from the Book,

*That God used the Ministry of Civil Magistrates, as well in other Countries, as amongst his own Peculiar People* Israel, *without any desert of theirs, but as in his Heavenly Providence be thought it most convenient.* Ch. 35. P. 83.

This seems to me to respect his Choice of the Persons of the Governours whose Ministry he useth, and since this was one Instance of the Theocracy of *Israel*, as the Convocation intimates, *when they tell us, that upon recourse to God, he did appoint one for their Prince, chief Captain, and Ruler.* P. 18. I think in this sort and Sense Christ P. 21. Jesus, to whom all Power both in Heaven and Earth is committed, doth for the good of his Catholick Church, thus rule the World. And for this Kingdom in particular, it is something remarkable, what Mr. *Camden* in his Remains, relates of one *Brithwald* a Monk, who not long before the Conquest, busying his Brain much about the Succession of the Crown, because the Royal Blood was almost extinguished, had a strange Vision, and heard a Voice, which forbad him to be Inquisitive of such Matters, sounding in his Ears, **The Kingdom of England is Gods own Kingdom, and for it God himself will Provide.**

But the Answerer doth not much oppose this, only he complains of a Brood of New Notions, amongst which
P. 14. Theocracy is one, and truly as he interprets it to be only *Gods Permissive Providence it is so*; But then that is a Notion of his own not of the Authors. He next takes notice of the Authors *Infortunity in proving his Principles, who*
P. 14,15. *to prove that Providence designs the Person of the Sovereign in other Kingdoms as well as in* Judah, *instances only in the*
P. 14. *Kingdom of* Judah. *And are not these Pure Proofs?* But the Author thought he had proved this from the Convocation-book, and brought those Instances only for an Illustration of the manner how God did it.

And for the case of *Reboboam*, whereon I had remarked, *That God sometimes for the only designed Usurpation of a Prince, whose Title, and that in an Hereditary Kingdom, was altogether indisputable, does deprive him of the Government in part, or whole, and will not allow him so much as to endeavour the regaining of it*; he finds two things that deserve Reflection; the one is, *That* Rehoboam's
P. 15. *not regaining the Ten Tribes, was expressly forbidden by God, and so nothing to our Authors purpose.* Yes therefore to the Authors purpose, because God did forbid it; for this clearly shews, that when a Prince is removed for his Usurpation, it is God that did deprive him; unless you will deny the Interposition of God in any other way, than express Revelation, which I suppose you dare not. And this is so visible a Judgment of God upon Unjust Kings, that the Book called *God and the King*, cannot but take notice of it, *That it is common, and familiar with God, when he is vehemently provoked by wicked Kings, and the Contemners of his Laws, to threaten them, that he will rent their Kingdoms from them, as he did from* Saul *and* Rehoboam, *and destroy and extirpate their Family. But had he not had that express Prohibition, might*
P. 15. *he not then have endeavoured to regain them?* Yes if he would. *And so he did*, but what then? doth God countenance Deposed Usurpers with Success? No! he never could regain his Right: Aud from this something more would follow than I shall mention.

*Edit. Lat. Lond.* 1651. *P.* 32.

The other thing, is a foul Prevarication of Scripture, *for the Author says, That God deprived* Rehoboam *of his Government, for his only designed Usurpation, whereas the Scripture is as express as can be, that it was for the Idolatry of his Father* Solomon, If so, I perceive

perceive *Rehoboam* had hard measure; and God, contrary to his expreſs word, made the *Child to bear the Iniquity of the Father*; which unleſs they imitate the Fathers in Sin, I believe the Anſwerer will not be ſo hardy as to aſſert; and let him conſider from hence, who makes boldeſt with Scripture. But tell me Sir, was the Cauſe of this Dethronement ſo wholly *Solomons* Idolatry, that *Rehoboam* had no Guilt in it: or if he had Any, ſpeak out, and ſhame the Devil. For you might pretend, if you ſo pleaſed, the Saying which the Lord ſpake by *Abijah*, when he promiſed *Jeroboam* (to whom he now gave) the Kingdom, to be the cauſe of it, that ſo Gods Word (which the Scripture alſo takes notice of) might be fulfilled. Yet neither of theſe being proper and perſonal to *Rehoboam*: ſome other muſt be produced to clear the Equity of Gods dealing with him. And ſince you diſallow what I have mentioned, pray Sir, turn over your Bible, and Squeeze out any other if you can. Believe me Sir, ſuch Trifling Illuſions as theſe may poſſibly become your Cauſe, but they do not your Coat..

But the willful Prevarication that follows it is Injurious to them both, for when I had noted, *That the Line of Deſcent in an Hereditary Kingdom might be interrupted, and yet the Law of Succeſſion not broken*; could I be ſuppoſed to mean it of *Rehoboam* and *Jeroboam*, who were nothing related; or of *Solomon* and *Adonijah*, who are mentioned in the ſame Paragraph, and where it is obſerved, that the Younger Brother was advanced to the Crown. I have heard, and I find it true, that none are ſo blind as thoſe that will not ſee.

## CHAP. VII.

### *Concerning a Thorough Settlement.*

WE are now come to the Mighty Place, and which indeed doth direct us in paying the Duty of our Allegiance; for the Convocation taking notice of the Variation of Governments in the World, having theſe words, *That when having attained their Ungodly Deſires (whether Ambitious Kings, by bringing any Country into their Subjection, or* Ch. 28. P. 57.

*Diſloyal*

*Diſloyal Subjects, by their Rebellions riſing againſt their natural Sovereign) they have eſtabliſhed any of the ſaid degenerate Forms of Government* viz. *Ariſtocratical, Democratical,* &c.) *amongſt their People; the Authority either ſo unjuſtly gotten, or wrung by force from the True and Lawful Poſſeſſor, being always Gods Authority (and therefore receiving no Impeachment by the Wickedneſs of thoſe that have it) is ever (when any ſuch Alterations are through ſetled) to be reverenced and obeyed, and the People of all ſorts (as well of the Clergy as of the Laity) are to be ſubject unto it, not only for Fear, but alſo for Conſcience ſake.*

Hereupon I had obſerved, that upon a Revolution from the worſt of Circumſtances, Uſurpation and Rebellion, Obedience to the Eſtabliſhment is acknowledged due. This the Anſwerer takes no notice of, as if it had been nothing concerned in the Cauſe. I then ſhow'd the vaſt Diſpacity betwixt that, their Repreſentation, and our preſent Merciful Deliverance and Settlement; but this alſo he paſſes over. But when I moved here upon the Queſtion, *when a Government may be ſaid to be ſettled,* there he leaps like a Fiſh at a Fly, and becauſe I left out the word *Throughly,* he thinks he has catch'd me Napping; and what if he had, greater than I are ſometimes ſo taken. But did I make any advantage of this Omiſſion, he charges me with none. Did I not, by Settlement, intend as much a Thorough Settlement, as if I had expreſſed it? I am ſure I did. And after all, what they call a *Thorough,* do I
P. 12. not expreſs it by *a Real Eſtabliſhment*; by which (for all he hath ſaid) I cannot yet but mean a Government that is Throughly Settled, for what I ſaid before I repeat again, *That that Government is then Setled, and throughly Setled, when the Crown with all its Dignities, Prerogatives, Adminiſtrations, Authorities, Revenues,* &c. *are generally Recognized and perſonally enjoyed; which muſt be ſuppoſed to be, when all Places of Power and Truſt, of Royalty and Importance, are in the Sovereigns hands, and wholly at his Diſpoſal. For to ſay, becauſe there are Foreign Wars, or Secret Plots, that the Crown is not in full Poſſeſſion, ſince there always were, and always will be, diſcontented Parties at home, and Politick Machinations abroad, that either actually do, or craftily deſign to diſturb the Peace, is to ſay, that no Kingdom ever was, or ever can be Setled.* He ſaw this laſt Period did obviate his Important Objection of *Limerick,* and therefore he wiſely (but how fairly let others judge) quite left it out. But *yet* Limerick *is a Place of Truſt,*

*and*

*and therefore the Authors Notion of Settlement will do him no service*, just as much as he intended, and neither more nor less. For it will prove as Thorough a Settlement now, as was in Queen *Elizabeth*, and some other Reigns when such-like places of Importance were in the Enemies hands. But *what becomes of the Poor Irish-men, he doubts they must be Rebels for all our Authors Demonstration.* And the Author doubts the Tories will be so still, which doubtless pleaseth the Answerer, and somebody else, besides one that would be call'd Most Christian very well: Then for the Rest, when the Answerer tells me, what became of *Jaddus*, whilst in the Power of *Darius*; I will send him back the very self-same Answer for his satisfaction. But a Victorious Army in *Ireland* sticks on his stomack, and tho he is willing to blast them, that they may fall before their Enemies; yet neither his Breath or Pen is so Omnipotent, and *therefore acknowledging* Ireland *to be a Branch of the Crown of* England, *annexed to it, and dependent on it*, he plainly justifies them. But *Athaliah* is brought on the Stage again, for without her he can prove nothing, and with her he only makes a noise.

P. 16.

ibid.

P. 17.

But because the Thorough Settlement is made the other Pillar to support their Cause, let us enquire what the Convocation intended by it. And since he says, *There are but two ways to understand the Sense of any Author: The natural and usual Construction of the words they express themselves by; and if there be any Obscurity or Doubt in the meaning of some Expressions, to interpret them by other Expressions, and Assertions in the same Author*; to which he might have added a third, had he so pleased, the occasion of the Authors writing. But because this would absolutely confute him; by his own Rules, I will try the Controversie before us.

Now the natural Construction of the words are very clear and easie; that whenever an Usurper or Rebels have gotten the Authority of a Lawful Possessor into their hands, and so throughly settled themselves, that they are able to hold, and maintain that same Authority which they have gotten; he or they, then are to be obeyed. And that they can mean no more by it, than an Ability to maintain the Authority they have got, is plain from the Context, and the whole Chapter, which speaks and treats of Wringing and Forcing this Power out of the hands of the True Possessor, and thereby throughly settling themselves. Nay which intimates, *the Usurper or Rebels having*

P. 57. *having attained their Ungodly Desires*, to be the Measure and Standard of this Thorough Settlement.

But the Answerer runs into Fancies of his own, and will have a Settlement to denote two things:

1. *The Legality of a Thing, its being according to Law.*

P. 18. Very well! And is not a King *de Facto, Seignior la Roy*, according to our Laws. He had much better for his own cause, have let this Notion of Settlement alone; But,

2. It denotes a quiet and peaceable Possession, without disturbance from other Claims or Pretenders. Ask his Grace of *Northumberland* this, whose Title of *Northumberland*, tho throughly settled, and so adjudged by the Supream Court in *England*, yet wants not a Pretender, who, they say, is again designing to make some disturbance about it. And if this be so, how ungrounded and unsettled is the Right of those Poor Princes in *Germany*, to whose Territories, the Answerers and his Masters Friend and Ally, the *Leviathan* of *France* lays a Claim, and creates Disturbances. *But the Owner is actually at Law with him, or declares that he will be so, so soon as he hath opportunity, or Money to manage the Suit.* But if Judgment be given, that the Man that is at Suit, is not the Owner. What then? Why! (without Reflection be it spoken) a Wrangling Knave, and a Litigious Barreter will never acquiesce.

*But there is one word more to be considered, and that is* ibid. *throughly*, **Throughly Settled.** Now what is the *Import of Throughly; but perfectly, to all intents and purposes.* Come then, and *let us put these together, and the Utmost of a Thorough Settlement is, such a Right as is enjoyed plainly, and evidently, without any Contradiction or Objection.* That is, such a Right as never will be in the World, for there is not that Crown upon any Princes Head, but what the variety of Principles amongst Men of diverse Parties, will afford them matter of Objections against. Such a Cobweb is the Answerers Thorough Settlement.

*His other way of understanding the Sense of an Author, is by consulting the Context, and other places, that that was their meaning, and no other.* Now what can you expect from such an Undertaker, but Demonstration as clear, nay clearer than the Authors; but *Parturiunt montes*, out comes the Case of *Athaliah*, for had he not that String, like a Trump Marine to Fiddle on, his Musick would be at an end. Yet upon this he hangs out a Flag of Defiance,

Defiance, and *defies the Author, or any body else, to shew him one single Instance (either in this Chapter, or any where in the whole Book) of any Government that the Convocation requires, and justifies Allegiance to be paid to, but what had first acquired a Right.* And if by Right he means a Civil Legal Right (which he must, or he says nothing) I say, and have before proved, That there are as many Instances of it, as there are of Revolutions of Government (for the Case of *Athalia* I have shew'd to be an exempt Case,) and to requite him, I defie him, and all his Party, to produce out of this Convocation-Book, one Instance, wherein Allegiance is denied to be due to *God's Authority, and to be owing to Legal Right*, for *Joash* (he by this time knows) is acknowledged to have both.

I all this while have waited, that the *Answerer* should have made good his stile of the Convocation by other parallel Expressions and Assertions in the Book, as he promised; but he hath disappointed me, and if it must be done, I must do it my self. To work then let us go. And besides a long continuance, or Prescription, to which both Parties acknowledge Allegiance to be due; but which in sudden Revolutions can have no place, and therefore is nothing to our present purpose. I find the Convocation supposeth these *New Forms of Government* (for so they call them, which intimates that they did not think Continuance to be absolutely necessary to their thorough Settlement) to be throughly settled. P. 17. *Can.* 28. *page* 59.

I. When the People are under the New Governor's Power and Protection; for so they affirm of the Jews, *That they were the Subjects of* Alexander, *after his Authority was setled amongst them*; which was when *Darius was vanquished, but was not alive, being escaped by flight.* Where the settlement of his Authority, and his favourable dealing with them (of which the Convocation speaks, but not a syllable of his Right) is made the Foundation of their Duty; and they further give this common Reason why the Jews were bound *to pray for the long Life and Prosperity both of* Alexander *and his Empire, as they had done of the other Kings*, **Because they lived under their Subjection.** *Can.* 31. *page* 67. *Pag.* 64, 65. *ibid.*

II. Especially if there be a general Submission of the People; for the want of this is given as one reason of *Antiochus* his Government not being setled amongst the *Jews*: And the access of this, is the only Title whereby *Mattathias* and his Posterity could claim Allegiance from the People; for I challenge the Answerer to produce out of the Convocation-Book, the intimation of the least Civil Right to it: *For if a Possessory Right be something, and*, as he saith, *where there is no better it ought to carry it*; it is plain, that *Antiochus* being possessed, had the better Legal Title; yet for want of the general Submission of the People, it was not esteemed setled; and therefore *Mattathias* his Claim is preferred before it. Of whom, though there neither was nor could be, our Answerer's Prescription, nor a long undisturbed Possession (the last Owner, in our Answerer's words, *being actually at Law with him*) nor any Legal Right or Title, but barely the Submission and Consent of the People (whence he may *ibid.* *ibid.* Page 19.

also learn how necessary their Consent is to a Government; yet of
*Can.*31. *p.*68. him: *After the Jews were delivered from their Servitude under the Kings of* Syria, *and the Government over them was setled in* Mattathias's *Posterity* (*the Convocation teacheth, that it was not lawful for the People, upon any occasion, to have rebelled against them, or to have offered violence to their Persons.* I know the Answerer pretends that *Antiochus* had no Right, and 'tis true he had not the Right which the Peoples Submission would invest him with; but he had Possession, and that is such a Right as our
P. 19. Answerer confesseth *ought to carry it.* If then you desire to know from the Convocation, what they mean by a *thorough Settlement*, beside the natural Signification of their words, *Can.* 28. you hence may see, That they suppose that Government to be Thoroughly setled, which hath Authority and Power to support it self; especially when owned and acknowledged by the general Submission of the People, and very cautiously is the word *General* made use of; for in such Revolutions an *universal Submission* is not to be expected.

Thus I have done with my Answerer, and I think, *Plainly demonstrated Submission and Obedience to the present Powers, to become the Answerer's Duty, as well as mine, if he dare stick to the Principle of the Convocation; for we have a Government so* thoroughly setled, *that it can never be unhing'd but with the utter Ruin of our Laws and Liberties, and the Desolation of the whole Kingdom.* A Government founded upon an Appeal to God for Truth and Justice, and so founded upon a Divine Right. A Government where if there be any Marks and Notes in Providence of God's positive Will and Pleasure, is so characterized and remarked by them (as the Pamphlet doth evidence) that the Answerer could not deny them. In short, I hope a Government that is the Reward of our steadiness and perseverance in the late Times of Tryal; and may God continue his Blessings to us, in continuing it.

But laying aside the Convocation, the Answerer proceeds to shew the Absurdity of my Interpretation from other Topicks. Now if what I have offered be indeed the sense of the Convocation (and let the Reader judge of it: but if it be so) what he bespatters me with are but so many virulent and base Reflections upon those Venerable Persons whereof the Convocation did consist. The Reply therefore swelling larger than I did expect, I am content to sit down and hear their Reproach.

Only from what I have said, let the Reader speak if he *think the Do-*
P. 21. *ctrine of Passive Obedience and Non-resistance to be* (*what the Answerer asserted*) *the whole design of that part of the Book that concerns Civil Government.*

Then for those Worthies of the Church of *England* that suffered between the years 42 and 60. a far worthier Pen hath already, and will more fully represent the difference betwixt our Case and theirs.

And as for the *Absurdity of this Doctrine, which* (he saith) *is, That the Permission of Providence is a Rule of Practice, and a sufficient Warrant to*
P. 23. *act contrary to the Rule of Right and Justice amongst Men.* I tell him this is not the Consequence, but a vile Aspersion cast upon the Convocation; for the utmost that can be extorted from it, is, That the Permission of Providence is a Rule of Practice, and a sufficient Warrant to Act. Besides, the Laws of Civil Right and strict Justice, when it hath placed Men in such Circumstances,

ſtances, that it is not poſſible for them to diſcharge ſome other Duties, and obſerve theſe Laws. And let him touch here if he can or dare, and therefore denying his Conſequence till he can better prove it (and I will give him to *latter-Lammas* to do it in) I am not accountable for all that putrid ſtuff that follows. *As if I taught that Men muſt direct their Lives, not by fixed and ſtated Rules, but by God's Permiſſions and Providential Occurrences, and the like.* All which want as much Honeſty, as they do Ingenuity. P. 23.

I purpoſely paſs by his undutiful Inſinuation, of a Thief's having ſtoln a Purſe, and giving it his Neighbour to keep; and then Querying upon it, Whether (ſince he came by it by Providence) he may not keep it. The Account I have already given, when it is, that Providence is a Rule of Practice, removes this Doubt: Which indeed deſerves another kind of Anſwer than a Pen can give. As alſo ſomething worſe than this, that in his Anſwer may more than once be met with. But I do not mean to turn Informer; nor have I any Stomach to recriminate, elſe I could charge him, and that truly, for building the Doctrines of Right to Crowns in New-erected Governments, upon Violence, Bloodſhed and Murther, for he again and again intimates, that if the Royal Line were but extinct, *i.e.* had they Murthered King *James*, and brought him to a Scaffold, when they deſired him but to withdraw; then the preſent Government had acquired a Right, and he could have taken the Oaths with a ſafe Conſcience. Now I believe his Maſter, King *James*, will ken him no Thanks for this his Doctrine. P. 24.

Before I cloſe, I muſt obſerve one thing from the Anſwerer, That after all his diſcarding Providence from being an Intimation of God's Will and Pleaſure in any Revolutions; yet upon my Aſſertion, That Predictions themſelves without this Interpoſition of Providence are not raſhly to be executed; for that *David* refuſed to ſtretch forth his Hand againſt the Lords Anointed; waiting his Way and Pleaſure, he confeſſeth, *That he left it to Gods Providence ſo to order and diſpoſe of things, and to bring it about in ſuch a manner, as he might take the Crown without the Violation if any Duty that he owed, or of any former Engagement he made to King* Saul. *Now when Providence*, ſaith he, *proceeds in this manner, and ſo makes a clear paſſage to Submiſſion; then, and then only, it is a juſtifiable ground to act upon.* I am glad that it is ever a juſtifiable ground to act upon, and doubt not but to ſhew in our caſe, ſomething of a parity to this, for if the taking of the Crown in ſuch a manner, as not to violate any Duty that he owed to others, does make a clear paſſage to Submiſſion, and is a juſtifiable ground then to act upon: pray Sir ſpeak, what Duty was violated by his Sacred Majeſty; or by ſuch as by Oath gave him Aſſurance of their Fidelity, when Providence in ſuch a viſible Divine manner had advanced him to the Throne? They durſt not oppoſe God, whoſe gracious Doing they not only ſuppoſed, but ſo proved it to be, that the Anſwerer it ſeems, was not ſtiff enough to deny it. And then for His Majeſty, no Obligation of a Subject was upon him, but if he ſuſpected himſelf to be wronged, (and there was violent and unſatisfied Suſpicion of Wrong in the Higheſt Nature, both to himſelf and the whole Kingdom countenanced, abetted, and deſigned to be eſtabliſhed) nothing could reſtrain him from ſeeking his Right P. 26. ibid.

but a Tame complying Willfulness to sit down content with his own Loss, and the Kingdoms Ruin. All that could be pretended to the contrary, is the Unseasonableness of seeking his Right; for, as *David*, they may say, He should have waited till the Lord should smite the King, or his day should come to dye, or that he should descend into Battle and perish. As for the last, his late Majesty is resolved to provide against that; but to this I reply, that his then Majesties Counsels had so ordered the Affairs, that they had made it absolutely necessary for his present Majesty then to seek his Right or never; in that the Parliament that was to be called, would doubtless (by the indirect means that were used) have been such as would have acknowledged and confirmed the Impostor, and so Excluded their present Majesties from the Crown. Add to this his late Majesties Willful Recess, and tell me then, *If Providence did not proceed in such a manner, as to make a clear passage to Submission, and so a justifiable ground to act upon.* Thus far I see no Guilt; then for what the Answerer seems to insist on, those Active Spirits that had an hand in the Revolution, by deserting the late King *James*, I excused them so far, that he takes no notice of it, and therefore I again Repeat it, and say that his Cause in their Conscience, being Bad, they neither could, nor ought actually to assist him: An Equity of the Cause being necessary to the Justification of a War. I now should have done, but for full satisfaction in the case, there is one thing I ought not to pass by.

The Answerer would make you believe that bare Possession is that Authority or Divine Right, that the Author all along speaks of; and so an Usurper may be possessed of it, an *Athaliah*, or *Antiochus*, or a *Cromwell*. Now the Author thinks, that there are certain Indices and Notes, whereby the Possession that he speaks of, and the Authority that is insisted on, may easily be discerned and distinguished. For the Convocation supposes a Thorough Settlement, before they Appropriate Obedience to the New Government. So that Possession in General cannot challenge the Allegiance, but yet the Authority they speak of may; for want of which Authority both *Athaliah*, and *Antiochus* (though they had got Possession) were Rightly opposed. Now what these Notes are (besides what is delivered in the Pamphlet) from the Convocation's Notion of a Thorough Settlement, will easily appear. For they requiring the Power, and Protection, or Favourable Dealing of a Prince, and Consent of the People to compleat a Settlement, in Opposition to these.

1. Usurped Possession seldom or never suffers the State to enjoy its Rights, Quiet and Protection; so that it is in vain, if it were possible, to yield Obedience, Violence, Plunder and Oppression do generally attend Usurped Possession, Law and Justice are stifled, and Arbitrariness rules in all things. Those who do not comply are not permitted to sit down in Peace, and enjoy the Common Benefit of Protection, but are Harass'd, Proscribed, Persecuted, and Undone. There is no Connivance, or Favour, but Power and Wilfulness manageth all Things; so that it is scarce possible for them to yield a Due and Full Obedience. For besides that Honour, Reverence and Homage, which (though owing to the Supreme Power) a Ruin'd, and Oppressed Subject can be hardly conceived to Give. The very Oppression it self disables them from paying Customs, Taxes and Tributes, which are other Branches of this Allegiance; so that the Service of a Liege Subject can scarce be given an Usurper; on the contrary, where it is Authority

that

that is advanced, there the Good of Community is intended, no Violence, Arbitrarineſs, and Injuſtice practiſed, but Law hath its courſe, and every unſuſpected Man his Liberty and Right. This is the very caſe of *Antiochus Epiphanes*, and *Athaliah*. Of the firſt the Convocation-book expreſſeth it. And of the laſt it is to be ſuppoſed that ſhe continued to Rule, as ſhe entred, with the utmoſt Cruelty and Violence: nay, and the very Reaſon of her Sons Wickedneſs (for which he was puniſhed by God) is imputed to her Inſtigation, in that ſhe is ſaid to be his Counſellour to do Wickedly. And of her, as well as of *Antiochus*, the *Jews* would have eaſed themſelves ſooner, had they but had power, for the Scriptures gives this as the reaſon of her Uſurpation, that the Houſe of *Ahaziah* had no power to keep ſtill the Kingdom. When therefore *Jehoiada* had ſtrengthned himſelf with the *Levites* and Officers, he dethroned the Uſurper, and exalted *Joaſh* to the Crown.

Secondly, A Uſurpation never meets with a quiet and peaceable Submiſſion of the People, I mean of the great Body of them, for no Revolution can expect them all. There are always powerful Confederacies and Deſigns againſt it, and 'tis only an Intereſted Party that Supports it. You ſhall meet not only with private Murmurings, but loud, open, and (what is worſt of all) moſt juſt and true Complaints. So that Mens Spirits are kept on ſuch a Ferment, that they may be over-awed, but cannot be won to a Willing Submiſſion. But where it is Gods Gracious Doings, you ſhall obſerve ſuch a Chearful Compliance, a ready Homage, and Acclamations ſo Univerſal, that ſuch a Voice of the People can ſcarce be otherwiſe Interpreted, than the Voice of God.

I deſire the Anſwerer to Scan over the Differences betwixt Gods Permiſſive and his Poſitive Providence, for if I be not groſly deceived, from the Principles that I have laid down; and the Intereſt the People have in Conſenting to the Form of Government, he may, if he pleaſe, diſcern the Difference betwixt 42 and 88. In Uſurpations beſides the Violence committed at the graſping at a Crown, which for the future hardens all Good Mens Hearts againſt it; the Subject, not enjoying Protection under it (as never any but an Intereſted Party do) cannot be thought to be ſo fond of Chains, as to Kiſs and Court them, by paying their Obedience under them, nor do they ever generally own it by ſubmitting Chearfully and Thankfully unto it. Whereas when there is a Revolution upon an Appeal to God for Juſtice and Equity; the Prince treats his People with ſuch Tenderneſs, Care, and Circumſpection, as becomes one that being advanced by, thinks himſelf accountable to God, for the Truſt he hath committed to him: And on the other hand the People deport themſelves with thoſe returns of Chearfulneſs and Thanks in their Submiſſion, as are befitting a People delivered from Wrong, Tyranny and Slavery. And by this time I hope the Anſwerer hath found out a Difference.

CHAP.

# CHAP. VIII.

## *The Close and Summary of the Whole.*

THE Summ and Substance of the Whole is this: God Delegates to Kings Authority and Power, to Govern the People committed to their Charge, in his Stead, and for their Good. And as a King in a Dependent Kingdom constitutes a Deputy, and Communicates with his Power part of his Name unto him, by making him a Vice-Roy: so God by exalting of them to that Great Trust, makes them, as it were, Vice-Gods; for of them he saith himself, That they are Gods: And as the Vice-Roy is Responsible to none but the King that entrusted him; so Kings are only Accountable to God, whose Power they have; and in whose Stead they Rule: and if they do abuse his Trust and Power, (seeing no one else can) God hath undertaken to call them to an Account for their Miscariages, since (as was said in the Pamphlet) all their Violations of this Trust reflect upon God, whose Trustees they are. And this is the Reason that makes him threaten so severely to punish Governors, that neglect his Laws, and abuse his Power. For as the King his Vice-Roy, so God may Depose them at his own Will and Pleasure. And when they Manage Affairs to his Dishonour, and the Discouragement of Virtue and Probity, as he may, so also (since he himself holds the Helms of all Governments in his own hands) it may be supposed that he will (for the sake of Justice) Animadvert upon them; for shall not the God of the Whole Earth do Right? No one else can; and therefore He, or none, must do it. And when he doth this, it often is by Removing them from that Power and Authority that he had Commissioned them with; and (as a King on the Complaint of the Misgovernment of a Vice Roy) by committing that Charge and Province to Another. For God doth Kings and Emperors no wrong, (though he thus displace them) they being Nothing else but his Agents and Officers, and to be Employ'd no longer than he knows it to be for the Good of his Church and People.

When ever therefore (for the sake of an Oppressed people) he is pleased thus to Remove and Displace an Arbitrary and Usurping Governor; and raise another to his Trust and Dignity, whom he (in his Infinite Wisdom) foresees to be more for the Good of his Church, and the Glory of his Providence; all Good people are in Conscience bound submissively to Comply with God's Doing, and yield a Chearful Obedience to his Authority; which where-ever it is, ought to be Reverenced. Now because the Meaning of God in such Revolutions are often Dark and Ambiguous; for they may be for our Sins, as well as the Sins of our Governors: therefore we ought throughly to debate the Case in our own Conscience, and unfeignedly and impartially Examine where the Guilt lies in Us, or in our Governors; for if for some conceived displeasure to their Persons or Government, we rashly, and too forwardly withdraw from them that Duty we owe, we do but add Iniquity to Sin. But if we find our selves in such Circumstances, that

that without any sinful Co operation of ours, a Door is opened for our Deliverance; One scarce can suppose it any thing, but God's Gracious Interposition. And since God doth by his Providence now, what in the days of Prophecy he did by his Immediate Revelations; when we see the same Events Consequent upon the same Antecedent Causes; and God hath plainly told us by his Word that He hath done the One; how can we deny (in a Parity of Causes and Events) but that the same Hand did also the Other. Especially when we see the Injured party flying to God for Help; or in the Use of the last Remedy making his Appeal for Justice. This is the Summary of the Whole Case, and it would be Hard indeed, if when Deliverance comes upon our Prayers and Tears, We might not embrace it. Let those that hanker after the Onions in an Egyptian Bondage fix their Eyes on them, till the Influence of the Acrimony force them to Weep; I, for my part, will Wipe mine Eyes and thank God, that there is no Leading into Captivity, and no more Complaining in Our Streets.

To close up All. Since the force of the Argument runs much upon *Providence*, which the Answerer would in this case (as a Loose Sect of Philosophers, that he knows of, do in others) discard from interposing so far, as to be an Inducement for Men to Act Agreeably to it. I cannot, for all him, but Conclude with a Remarque of the Wonderful Providence of God in Reserving this Convocation-Book, (which was so long concealed,) for the Publication of these Difficult Times, and the Determination of so Weighty a Matter. I will not say, what Party put it forth; but there seems to be a Providence in that too. But I will say, It hath had Good success, in Bringing over One, that was the Bulwark of their Cause. And that it may prove more and more so Successful, in prevailing with the Answerer, and the Right Reverend the Fathers and Pastors of This our Too much Divided Church, is the Hearty and Daily Prayers of the Author; which may God Almighty in his own Good Time both Hear and (instead of any other) Answer, *Amen*.

---

## A True Copy of a Letter Writ by King *James* the First, to Dr. *Abbot*, concerning the Convocation called *Anno* 1603. 1. *Jac.* and continued by Adjournments and Prorogations to 1610. Now in the Hands of a Gentleman of the Temple.

Good Dr. *Abbot*,

I *Cannot abstain to give you my Judgment of your Proceedings in your Convocation as you call it; and both, as* Rex in solio, *and* unus gregis in Ecclesia, *I am doubly concerned. My Title to the Crown no body calls in question, but they that neither love you nor me; and you guess whom I mean. All that you and your Brethren have said of a King in Possession* (*for that word I tell you,*

you, is no worse than that you make use of in your Canon) concerns not me at all. I am the next Heir, and the Crown is mine by all Rights you can name, but that of Conquest; and Mr. Sollicitor has sufficiently expressed my own Thoughts concerning the Nature of Kingship in General, and concerning the Nature of it, ut in mea Persona: And I believe you were all of his Opinion; at least none of you said aught contrary to it, at the time he spoke to you from me. But you know all of you, as I think, that my Reason of calling you together, was to give your Judgments how far a Christian, and a Protestant King, may concur to assist his Neighbours to shake off their Obedience to their own Sovereign, upon the account of Oppression, Tyranny, or what else you like to name it. In the late Queens time, this Kingdom was very free in assisting the Hollanders both with Arms and Advice; and none of your Coat ever told me, that any scrupled at it in her Reign. Upon my coming to England you may know that it came from some of your selves to raise Scruples about this Matter. And albeit I have often told my Mind concerning Jus Regium in Subditos, as in May last in the Star-Chamber, upon the occasion of Hales his Pamphlet; yet I never took any notice of these Scruples, till the Affairs of Spain and Holland forced me to it. All my Neighbours call on me to concur in the Treaty between Holland and Spain; and the Honour of the Nation will not suffer the Hollanders to be abandoned, especially after so much Money and Men spent in their Quarrel. Therefore I was of the Mind to call my Clergy together, to satisfie not so much me, as the World about us of the Justness of my owning the Hollanders at this time: This I needed not to have done; and you have forced me to say, I wish I had not. You have dipped too deep in what all Kings Reserve among the Arcana Imperii. And whatever Aversion you may profess against Gods being the Author of Sin, you have Stumbled upon the Threshold of that Opinion, in saying upon the Matter, that even Tyranny is Gods Authority, and should be Reverenced as such. If the King of Spain should return to claim his old Pontifical Right to my Kingdom, you leave me to seek for others to Fight for it: For you tell us upon the Matter before hand, his Authority is Gods Authority, if he prevail.

Mr. Doctor, I have no time to express my Mind farther in this Thorny Business. I shall give you my Orders about it by Mr. Sollicitor, and until then meddle no more in it, for they are Edge Tools, or rather like that Weapon that's said to Cut with the one Edge, and Cure with the other. I commit you to God's Protection, Good Dr. Abbot, And rest

Your Good Friend

James R.

FINIS.